1	2	3	4	5
7.	Haryana	(−)1540	(−)1185	(−)1033
8.	Himachal Pradesh	(−)1022	(−)106	(−)848
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	(−)400	(−)542	(+)508
10.	Karnataka	(−)1215	(−)2325	(−)2175
11.	Kerala	(−)2030	(−)3622	(−)3232
12.	Madhya Pradesh	(−)2872	(−)2932	(−)2205
13.	Maharashtra	(−)3926	(−)4269	(−)6224
14.	Manipur	(+)106	(−)287	(+)13
15.	Meghalaya	(+)17	(+)16	(+)44
16.	Mizoram	(+)78	(−)31	(+)23
17.	Nagaland**	(−)23	(−)9	@
18.	Orissa	(−)2262	(−)2574	(−)1657
19.	Punjab	(−)2629	(−)2727	(−)2573
20.	Rajasthan	(−)2996	(−)3640	(−)2610
21.	Sikkim	(−)55	(+)2	(+)161
22.	Tamil Nadu	(−)3437	(−)4400	(−)3922
23.	Tripura	(+)93	(−)23	(−)72
24.	Uttar Pradesh	(−)8696	(−)7253	(−)5819
25.	West Bengal	(−)4856	(−)9287	(−)7411

@= Amount (−) Rs. 41 Lakhs
RE = Revised Estimate
* = 1999-00 (Revised Estimates)
** = 1999-00 (State Government figures)
Source: Finance Accounts/Budget Documents of the State Governments

Income Tax outstanding from BCCI

980. SHRI CHO S. RAMASWAMY: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the total amount of income tax outstanding from the BCCI;

(b) what steps are being taken to recover the dues from them;

(c) whether it is a fact that Government are slow and indifferent in collecting the dues from the BCCI;

(d) whether the BCCI has approached the Courts for the waiver of the tax; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI GINGEE N. RAMACHANDRAN): (a) The total amount of Income Tax outstanding against BCCI is Rs. 72.37 crores for the assessment years 1996-97 and 1998-99.

(b) In respect of demand for A.Y. 1996-97, the income of PILCOM has been assessed in the hands of M/s. BCCI on protective basis. Since the demand is raised on protective basis, the same has been stayed by DIT(E), Mumbai.

As regards demand for the A.Y. 1998-99, the assessee had applied for stay of demand, which was rejected. The assessee was asked to pay the demand in five monthly instalments commencing from 26.10.2001. So far, the assessee has failed to make any payment. In the light of the above default, coercive step has been taken, by issuing notice u/s 221 of the I.T. Act.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) M/s. BCCI has preferred appeals against the assessment orders before CIT(A)-XXXII, Mumbai.

Malepam Committee

981. SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Malepam Committee has submitted its report on UTI's corporate repositioning;

(b) if so, what are the recommendations; and

(c) what is Government's reaction to those recommendations?